

REMARKS

Claims 11-25 were pending in the above-identified application when last examined. This response amends claims 11, 14, 15, 17, 20, 21, 24, and 25 and adds claim 26. For the following reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the application including claims 11-26.

Claims 11-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by or alternatively under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,414,635 (Stewart). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 11 distinguishes over Stewart at least by reciting, “said information access point including apparatus for retrieving information relating to trusted computing platforms located within said pre-determined geographical area.” Stewart fails to disclose or suggest trusted computing platforms. As described in Applicants’ disclosure, a trusted computing platform includes a trusted component, which includes hardware that is inviolate, and uses physical connectivity of hardware to thwart the actions of malicious software. Stewart does not address or suggest the requirements or issues concerning enabling interaction of a visitor with a local trusted computing platform. For example, Stewart is not concerned with and does not suggest how to provide a visitor with information that the visitor will trust to a confidence level provided by trusted computing platforms. In particular, if the provided information regarding trusted computing platforms is untrustworthy, the security advantages provided by trusted computing platforms may not be fully achieved.

Claim 11 further distinguishes over Stewart by reciting, “said information system being arranged to provide said information to a portable computing apparatus visiting the pre-determined geographical area, wherein said information enables interaction with trusted components of said trusted computing platforms.” Stewart discloses obtaining security information from a portable device accessing a terminal. See, for example, Stewart, col. 8, lines 9-12. However, claim 11 recites providing information to a portable computing apparatus.

For the above reasons, claim 11 is patentable over Stewart.

Claims 12-20 depend from claim 11 and are patentable over Stewart for at least the same reasons that claim 11 is patentable over Stewart.

Claim 12 further distinguishes over Stewart by reciting, “said information system is arranged to provide as said information only details and/or a list of public keys of genuine trusted computing platforms within said pre-determined geographical area.” In regard to this element, the Office Action cites Stewart, col. 8, lines 9-12. The cited portion of Stewart describes transferring a certificate (not a public key) from PCD 110, i.e., from a portable apparatus. Stewart does not suggest transfer of a public key to a portable apparatus.

Claim 15 further distinguishes over Stewart by reciting, “said apparatus for communicating or interacting with the portable computing apparatus is arranged to perform said communication or interaction by physical contact or directional wireless communication.” Stewart does not employ or suggest a system requiring physical contact of the portable device to the access point, particularly because Stewart teaches locating a user that is away from any access point. Further, although Stewart does disclose determining a bearing or direction to the portable device as disclosed in col. 3, lines 47-53, Stewart does not disclose or suggest a directional wireless communications as recited in claim 15. In particular, Stewart does not suggest that wireless communications be limited to a specific direction. In accordance with an aspect of Applicants’ invention, a user can better trust information received by a portable device when the user knows the source of the information. Physical contact or directional wireless communication allows a user to identify the source by human perception/sight.

Claim 17 further distinguishes over Stewart by reciting, “said declaration is capable of interpretation by a user … without preprocessing by an information processing system.” Stewart does not suggest a user interpreting a declaration of an access point without preprocessing. However, in accordance with an aspect of Applicants’ invention, a visible certificate may allow a user to better trust a source of information on trusted computing platforms in an area.

Independent claim 21 patentably distinguishes over Stewart at least by reciting “retrieving to the information access point information relating to trusted computing platforms within the geographical area; and providing the information from the information access point to a portable computing apparatus visiting the pre-determined geographical area.” As noted above, Stewart fails to disclose or suggest trusted computing platforms, retrieving to an access point information concerning trusted computing platforms in a geographical area, or providing such information to a visiting portable computing apparatus. Accordingly, claim 21 is patentable over Stewart.

Claims 22-25 depend from claim 21 and are patentable over Stewart for at least the same reasons that claim 21 is patentable over Stewart.

For the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

New claim 26 depends from claim 21 and is patentable over Stewart for at least the same reasons that claim 21 is patentable over Stewart.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the application including claims 11-26.

Respectfully submitted,

/David Millers 37396/

David Millers
Reg. No. 37,396

PATENT LAW OFFICE OF
DAVID MILLERS
1221 SUN RIDGE ROAD
PLACERVILLE, CA 95667
PH: (530) 621-4545
FX: (530) 621-4543